

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

105th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 192

July 22, 1997, 2:42 pm
Page S-7823 Temp. Record

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS/Final Passage

SUBJECT: Military Construction Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1998 . . . H.R. 2016. Final passage, as amended.

ACTION: BILL PASSED, 98-2

SYNOPSIS: As passed, H.R. 2016, the Military Construction Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1998, will provide \$9.183 billion in new budget authority (BA) for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense. This amount is \$799.7 million more than requested and \$610.4 million less than the amount appropriated for fiscal year (FY) 1997. Key details are provided below.

- military construction: \$3.178 billion, including \$568.7 million for the National Guard and Reserves (the Administration only requested \$172.9 million for the Guard and Reserves).
- military family housing: \$3.821 billion (\$152.3 million more than requested).
- Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC): \$2.061 billion (equal to the amount requested).
- North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Security Investment Program: \$152.6 million.

Those favoring final passage contended:

This bill will cut spending by 6 percent from last year's level. Total spending will be 21 percent lower than it was just 2 years ago. If every area of the Government were cut as substantially, the United States would run large surpluses every year and wipe out the debt. Within the limited funds provided, key areas will receive increased funding. Those areas include large increases over the President's request for military housing and medical facilities. They also include large increases for construction for Guard and Reserve projects. Our colleagues deride those projects as unnecessary, but as the active duty forces continue to shrink the importance of the Guard and Reserves is going to continue to grow. Congress has already decided that as a matter of policy the defense that the United States can afford (or at least is willing to pay for) will have to depend largely on reserve forces. The Pentagon is still resisting

(See other side)

YEAS (98)				NAYS (2)		NOT VOTING (0)	
Republican (53 or 96%)		Democrats (45 or 100%)		Republicans (2 or 4%)	Democrats (0 or 0%)	Republicans (0)	Democrats (0)
Abraham	Helms	Akaka	Johnson	Kyl			
Allard	Hutchinson	Baucus	Kennedy	McCain			
Ashcroft	Hutchison	Biden	Kerrey				
Bennett	Inhofe	Bingaman	Kerry				
Bond	Jeffords	Boxer	Kohl				
Brownback	Kempthorne	Breaux	Landrieu				
Burns	Lott	Bryan	Lautenberg				
Campbell	Lugar	Bumpers	Leahy				
Chafee	Mack	Byrd	Levin				
Coats	McConnell	Cleland	Lieberman				
Cochran	Murkowski	Conrad	Mikulski				
Collins	Nickles	Daschle	Moseley-Braun				
Coverdell	Roberts	Dodd	Moynihan				
Craig	Roth	Dorgan	Murray				
D'Amato	Santorum	Durbin	Reed				
DeWine	Sessions	Feingold	Reid				
Domenici	Shelby	Feinstein	Robb				
Enzi	Smith, Bob	Ford	Rockefeller				
Faircloth	Smith, Gordon	Glenn	Sarbanes				
Frist	Snowe	Graham	Torricelli				
Gorton	Specter	Harkin	Wellstone				
Gramm	Stevens	Hollings	Wyden				
Grams	Thomas	Inouye					
Grassley	Thompson						
Gregg	Thurmond						
Hagel	Warner						
Hatch							

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

the "total force" concept; every year each service defends its own parochial budget and gives short shrift to the needs of the Guard and Reserves, thereby forcing Congress to add the necessary funding. Another notable feature of this bill is that it will appropriate less money than the President requested for overseas construction projects. Fully 24 percent of the President's proposed construction spending was for overseas projects. This bill will cut back on that proposed funding because only 16 percent of our Armed Forces are stationed outside of the United States, and that percentage will likely decline in the next few years. Overall, there is very broad, bipartisan agreement on the priorities and funding levels in this bill. It should pass by an overwhelming margin.

Those opposing final passage contended:

For the past several years, President Clinton has inadequately funded the national security interests of this Nation. With a Republican Congress in control for the past 3 years, slightly more than \$20 billion has been added back to the inadequate budgets proposed by the President. Most of those funds have been added back to meet extremely urgent defense needs. Unfortunately, a little more than 10 percent of the money, including the additional money in this bill, has been earmarked for low-priority military construction projects. This year is the worst of the three. Only \$2.6 billion will be added back, and nearly one-third of the funds will be spent on construction projects of very questionable value. We are especially upset that an unrequested, unneeded 500-percent increase in funding will be given to the Army Guard for such projects. We would be interested in knowing what decisionmaking process went into demanding the building of 13 new readiness and Reserve centers even though the Guard and Reserve end strengths will be cut by over 54,000; we wonder why particular projects, such as the refrigeration unit at the skating rink in Kentucky, are of such importance that they merit earmarks for additional funding; we wonder why projects that receive earmarks seem always to fall disproportionately in a few States. Even with the money that Congress has added back to the President's inadequate defense requests, our military budget is too low. Military training exercises continue to be cut, aircraft and ship maintenance backlogs are growing, military health care is underfunded, 11,781 service members are on food stamps and many more are eligible, and military housing is substandard and in short supply. We even heard recently that many sailors stationed in San Diego live in Mexico and commute because they cannot afford to live in the United States. Given the serious underfunding that exists for defense, we think it is criminal to waste money on unneeded military construction projects. In protest, we oppose final passage.